



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,340	11/01/2001	David R. Davis	P1756US00	2531
23531	7590	03/11/2004	EXAMINER	
SUITER WEST PC LLO 14301 FNB PARKWAY SUITE 220 OMAHA, NE 68154			PHAN, THANH S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/040,340

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh S Phan

Art Unit

2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 37-39, 51 and 52 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-24, 27-36, 40-43 and 45-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 26 and 44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The final rejection of claims 7-52 is withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks in the brief filed on 12/03/03 and newly discovered reference(s) to Fiora et al. [US 6,480,398]. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

#### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the matrix of reinforcing ribs must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18-19, 33, 40-41 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 18 and 40 recite the limitation "the single handedly operational squeezable handle" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 33, applicant should clarify the structure intended by “the either the major.”

Regarding claim 47, applicant should clarify how both the stationary and movable part of the handle are squeezed together.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fiora et al. [5,877,938].

Fiora et al. disclose an information handling case [figure 1], comprising a chassis [figure 6] suitable for containing an electronic component; an access door [12a] which covers the opening and removably mounted to the chassis, the access door suitable for permitting access to an electronic component contained in the computer chassis; and a release mechanism [32] adjacent to the access door, wherein the release mechanism is manually operable by a single hand of a user to release the access door from the chassis, the access door separating from the chassis upon manipulation of the release mechanism by the user [column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 7].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiora et al. in view of McMiller et al. [US 6,194,653].

Regarding claim 16, Fiora et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the chassis including a U-shape clip and the access door including a flange made of a conductive material wherein the flange engages the U-shape clip when the access door is installed on the chassis.

McMiller et al. disclose a casing [figure 1] for an electronic component having at least a plurality u-shaped EMI clips [figure 5] mounted on flanges surrounding a perimeter of the casing [116, figure 1] to receive a cover thereon.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the EMI clip design of McMiller et al. with the access panel door of Fiora et al. for the purpose of providing protection from EMI interference.

Claims 17, 18, 29, 40-41, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs et al. [US 5,877,938] in view Fiora et al. and McMiller et al.

Hobbs et al. disclose an information handling case [figure 1], comprising a chassis [figure 4a] suitable for containing an electronic component; an access door [20] which covers the opening mounted on hinging pins that fit within slots on the chassis so as to provide a rotational movement thereabout and permit removal of the door from the chassis [column 10, line 39-column 11, line 5]; and a release mechanism [90] adjacent to the access door.

Hobbs et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the release mechanism is manually operable by a single hand of a user to release the access door from the chassis and the chassis including a U-shape clip and the access door including a flange made of a conductive material wherein the flange engages the U-shape clip when the access door is installed on the chassis.

Fiora et al. disclose an information handling case [figure 1], comprising a chassis [figure 6] suitable for containing an electronic component; an access door [12a] which covers the opening and removably mounted to the chassis, the access door suitable for permitting access to an electronic component contained in the computer chassis; and a release mechanism [32] adjacent to the access door, wherein the release mechanism is manually operable by a single hand of a user to release the access door from the chassis, the access door separating from the chassis upon manipulation of the release mechanism by the user [column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 7].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use release mechanism of Fiora et al. for the locking mechanism of Hobbs et al. for the purpose of facilitating access to the casing inner components.

McMiller et al. disclose a casing [figure 1] for an electronic component having at least a plurality u-shaped EMI clips [figure 5] mounted on inner flanges surrounding substantially an entire perimeter of the casing [116, figure 1] to receive a cover thereon.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the EMI clip design of McMiller et al. with the access panel door of Fiora et al. for the purpose of providing protection from EMI interference.

Claims 19, 30 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs et al., as modified, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Casebolt [US 6,437,980].

Hobbs et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the use of a thumbscrew mounted on the panel access door via a connection tab.

Casebolt discloses the use of a thumbscrew [figure 3b] mounted on a cover of a computer case via a connection tab [figures 2c-2d].

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the thumb screw design of Casebolt on the panel door of Hobbs et al., as modified, for the purpose of securing the door in place and preventing inadvertent opening thereof.

Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs et al. in view of Anderson.

Regarding claims 20-22, Hobbs et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the access panel being opened from a latched state by squeezing a handle.

Hobbs et al. discloses opening the access panel by inserting a proper key into lock [90].

Anderson discloses a squeezable handle [figure 2] mechanism used to open a door by squeezing handle portions [14] together.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the handle operation method of Anderson instead of that of Hobbs et al. in order to permit access to the casing without a key.

Regarding claims 23-24, Hobbs et al. discloses the hinging members being pairs of hooks corresponding to retentive elements of the computer chassis [column 10, line 39-column 11, line 5].

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs et al. [US 5,877,938] in view Fiora et al.

Hobbs et al. disclose an information handling case [figure 1], comprising a chassis [figure 4a] suitable for containing an electronic component; an access door [20] which covers the opening mounted on hinging pins that fit within slots on the chassis so as to provide a rotational movement thereabout and permit removal of the door from the chassis [column 10, line 39-column 11, line 5]; and a release mechanism [90] adjacent to the access door.

Hobbs et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the release mechanism is manually operable by a single hand of a user to release the access door from the chassis.



Fiora et al. disclose an information handling case [figure 1], comprising a chassis [figure 6] suitable for containing an electronic component; an access door [12a] which covers the opening and removably mounted to the chassis, the access door suitable for permitting access to an electronic component contained in the computer chassis; and a release mechanism [32] adjacent to the access door, wherein the release mechanism is manually operable by a single hand of a user to release the access door from the chassis, the access door separating from the chassis upon manipulation of the release mechanism by the user [column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 7].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use release mechanism of Fiora et al. for the locking mechanism of Hobbs et al. for the purpose of facilitating access to the casing inner components.

Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiora et al. in view of Buican et al. [US 6,373,690].

Fiora et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the access door having flanges on one of its sides and a matrix of reinforcing ribs covering the planar side of the access panel door which faces the opening of the chassis when mounted.

Buican et al. disclose a front panel [14] having flanges and reinforcing ribs covering the planar side of the access panel door which faces the opening of the chassis when mounted [figures 7 & 2].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the flange/rib design of Buican et al. for the access door of Fiora et al., in order to provide rigidity to the door structure.

Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiora et al. in view of Benck et al. [US 5,191,544].

Fiora et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the access door being formed of conductive material.

Benck et al. discloses forming an access door for a computer enclosure of conductive metal material [column 5, line 44-column 6, line 8, figure 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use conductive material for the access door of Fiora et al., as suggested by Benck et al., in order to provide EMI shielding for the inner components.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiora et al.

Fiora et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the specific size of the opening being slightly smaller than the entire expanse of the one side of computer chassis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the

Fiora et al. disclose the opening be slightly smaller than the entire expanse of the one side of computer chassis for the purpose of having the panel be flush with the side of the chassis.

Claims 42 and 45-46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs et al., as modified, as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Hulick et al. [US 5,825,626].

Hobbs et al., as modified, disclose the instant claimed invention except for: the specific shape of the hinge support.

Hulick et al. discloses a lockable panel [14] mounted to a computer chassis [figure 2] having a plurality of curved hooks [26] mounted in corresponding slots on the chassis.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the hinge support design of Hulick et al. in Hobbs et al, as modified, for the purpose of facilitating mounting and removal of the door from the chassis.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 7-14, 37-39 and 51-52 are allowed.

Claims 25-26 and 44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 47 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh S Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-2109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2841

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S Martin can be reached on 571-272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tsp

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'D' followed by a series of loops and a long, sweeping stroke that extends upwards and to the right.

**DAVID MARTIN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**